REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed December 13, 2005. Claims 1-29 were examined in the Office Action. Claims 1-29 were rejected. No new claims have been added. Claims 1, 9, 11, 16-18, 23, 24, and 26 have been amended. Claims 21, 23, and 29 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and continued examination in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-4, 6, 9-13, 16-17, 25 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tognazzini, U.S. Patent No. 5,790,974 (hereinafter Tognazzini) in view of Henneuse et al, U.S. patent No. 5,963,913 (hereinafter Henneuse). Applicants respectfully submit that Tognazzini in view of Henneuse does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' amended independent claims 1, 9, 16, 17, and 25.

Claim 1

Applicants' amended claim 1 is drawn to a computer-implemented method for providing location-sensitive and time-sensitive calendaring to a wireless device. The method comprises, among other features, (1) determining that a time reading is within a predetermined minimum of a meeting start time of an appointment of a calendar of a user. The appointment includes a plurality of meeting attendees stored in association with the appointment on the wireless device. The method also involves (2) sending a late message from a server to the plurality of meeting attendees via a wireless network if the estimated time of arrival is after the meeting start time, (3) sending a roll call request, (4) receiving current locations and/or approximate arrival times of the plurality of attendees in response to sending the roll call request, and (5) providing a notification to the user as to when to proceed to the meeting place in order to be on time based on the estimated time of arrival.

In contrast Tognazzini discloses a personal calendaring system with an office calendar compliment for an individual and thus, does not contemplate (3) sending a roll call request to a plurality of attendees. Also, although Henneuse discloses a method for scheduling an event, Henneuse does not disclose (4) receiving current locations and/or approximate arrival times of the plurality of attendees in response to sending the roll call request, and (5) providing a

9

notification to the user as to when to proceed to the meeting place in order to be on time based on the estimated time of arrival as recited in claim 1. (See Tognazzi abstract and Henneuse column 1, lines 42-55). Providing a notification based on estimated time of arrival is not analogous with a static (10 and 5 minute) reminder before a meeting start time. In fact, the Office Action acknowledges that Tognazzinii and Henneuse fail to teach providing a notification to the user as to when to proceed in order to be on time base on ETA. (See Office Action, page 15, lines 10-12).

The Office Action states that Tognazzini discloses sending an estimated time of arrival (ETA) for each of the plurality of meeting attendees. Applicants, respectfully traverse this assertion and submit that Tognazzini only addresses the ETA of the user and not each of the plurality of meeting attendees as recited in claim 1. In contrast, Tognazzini discloses a personal calendaring system including a portable system and an office system. Although Tognazzini discloses calculating an estimated time of arrival (ETA), Tognazzini does not base this calculation on a velocity of the user as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office Action cites column 2, lines 10-67 in support of an assertion that Tognazzini discloses determining a velocity of the user. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion and submit that the cited section only refers to stored travel times between identified locations and mapped geographic coordinates that do not consider the actual velocity of the user which may depend on a user's mode of transportation, e.g. walking, bike, motorcycle, car, etc.. The traffic data used to help estimate a time of arrival only provides information about traffic and does not consider the individual actual speed despite the traffic. (See Tognazzini column 2 lines 15-20, lines 50-62 and column 7, lines 55-65). Because the travel information and traffic data are estimates based on maps and overall traffic reports and does not consider that the velocity of the user may be different than traffic based on a mode of transportation, for instance if the user is traveling on foot, Tognazzini does not teach or suggest (2) determining ETA based on a velocity of the user as recited in amended claim 1.

Also, the Office Action acknowledges that Tognazzini fails to teach a plurality of meeting attendees and sending a late message to the plurality of meeting attendees. However, the Office Action relies on Henneuse to resolve the deficiencies of Tognazzini. Henneuse discloses a system and method, including message notification, for scheduling an event subject

10

to the availability of requested participants. The Office Action goes on to state "it would have been obvious...to include the message notification to the meeting attendees of Henneuse with the teachings of Tognazzini since Tognazzini teaches a message is sent with the modified schedule information in the form of a preformatted e-mail message" (col. 14, lines 30-39). (See page 7, paragraph 2 of the Office Action).

Applicants respectfully assert that Tognazzini only contemplates a personal calendaring system in communication with an office system. The sent message disclosed in Tognazzini is sent from the portable system 12 based on personal data stored on the portable system 12. Neither Tognazzini nor Henneuse alone, or in combination, disclose capacity to store a plurality of meeting attendees in association with an appointment on a portable wireless calendaring system. Thus, Tognazzini in view Henneuse, does not teach or suggest Applicants amended claim 1 because the portable system 12 of Tognazzini, which sends the message alerting the office system 10, teaches away from having the capacity of a server to send a message to a plurality of attendees. Tognazzini only notifies the office system 10. (See Tognazzini Fig. 1, column 14, lines 30-39 and column 4, lines 59-64 and Henneuse column 1, 43-60). Thus, neither Tognazzini nor Henneuse alone, or in combination, teach or suggest amended claim 1.

<u>Claim 9</u>

Applicants amended claim 9 is drawn to a computer-implemented method for providing location-sensitive and time-sensitive calendaring to a wireless device. The method comprises, among other features, (1) determining an estimated time of arrival of the user at the meeting place <u>based on a mode of transportation for the user</u>, (2) if the estimated time of arrival is after the meeting start time, then sending a message <u>via a wireless network</u> to the wireless device indicating the estimated time of arrival, and (3) <u>receiving a mode of transportation for the user comprising an indication as to whether the user is traveling by foot</u>. As described above with respect to amended claim 1, Tognazzini does not base ETA calculations on a velocity of the user and thus does not contemplate a user's mode of transportation as recited in amended claim 9. Also, because the agent 16b resides on the portable system 12, the agent outputs an alert to the graphic user interface residing on the same portable system. (See Fig. 1 and column 7, lines 7-10 of Tognazzini). Thus, Tognazzini does not teach or suggest 2) sending a message <u>via a wireless network</u> to the wireless device indicating the estimated time of arrival. Further, neither of the

11

cited references alone, or in combination, disclose receiving an indication as to whether the user is traveling by foot. Therefore, amended claim 9 is also allowable over Tognazzini in view of Henneuse.

Claims 16 and 17

Applicants' claim 16 is drawn to a system for providing location-sensitive calendar information to a wireless device. Claim 17 has similar recitations. The system comprises, among other features, a calendaring program running on the server. The server determines a present time and a present location of the wireless device of a user. The wireless device stores a plurality of meeting attendees in association with an appointment, the appointment comprising a meeting time and a meeting location. The server also compares the present time and the present location to a meeting time and a meeting location in a calendar file associated with the user to determine an estimated time of arrival and provides a notification as to when at least one meeting attendee should proceed to the meeting place in order to be on time based on the distance between the location of the at least one meeting attendee and the location of the meeting place. If the estimated time of arrival is after the meeting time the server sends a late message to the wireless device. As described above with respect to amended claim 1, providing a notification based on estimated time of arrival is not analogous with a static (10 and 5 minute) reminder before a meeting start time. Thus, claims 16 and 17 are also allowable over Tognazzini in view of Henneuse and/or PR Newswire (PR Newswire, BellSouth Cellular will Evaluate SigmaOne Communications' Sigma 5000 AMPS-TDMA Wireless Location System, PR Newswire, New York 17 November 1999 OPROQUEST.

Claim 25

Applicants' amended claim 25 is drawn to a computer program product including a computer-readable medium having control logic stored therein for causing a computer to provide location-sensitive and time-sensitive calendaring. The control logic comprises computer-readable program code for causing the computer to, among other features, estimate commute time required for the at least one calendar event attendee to travel from the location of the at least one calendar event attendee to the location of the approaching calendar event based on a velocity of the calendar event attendee. As described above with respect to amended claim 1, Tognazzini

12

does not base ETA calculations on a velocity of the user and thus only refers to stored travel times between identified locations and mapped geographic coordinates that do not consider the actual velocity of the user. Thus, amended claim 25 is allowable over Tognazzini in view of Henneuse.

Claim 18

Claims 5, 7-8, 14-15, 18-19, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tognazzini in view of Henneuse and further in view of PR Newswire (PR Newswire, BellSouth Cellular will Evaluate SigmaOne Communications' Sigma 5000 AMPS-TDMA Wireless Location System, PR Newswire, New York 17 November 1999 OPROQUEST hereafter "PR1"). Applicants respectfully submit that Tognazzini in view of Henneuse and PR1 does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' amended independent claim 18.

Applicants' amended claim 18 is drawn to a computer-implemented method for providing location-sensitive and time-sensitive calendaring to a wireless device. The method comprises, among other features, determining an estimated time of arrival of each of the plurality of meeting attendees at the meeting place based on a mode of transportation of each of the plurality of meeting attendees and providing a notification to the user as to when to proceed to the meeting place in order to be on time based on an estimated time of arrival for the user. As described above with respect to amended claim 1, Tognazzini does not base ETA calculations on a velocity of the user and thus does not contemplate a user's mode of transportation as recited in amended claim 18. Further, none of the cited references alone, or in combination, disclose providing notification based on ETA which is not analogous with a static reminder. Thus, neither Tognazzini, Henneuse, nor PR1 alone, or in combination, teach or suggest amended claim 18. Therefore amended claim 18 is allowable over Tognazzini in view of Henneuse and PR1.

Dependent Claims

Claims 20-24, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tognazzini in view of Henneuse and further in view of M2 Presswire (M2 Presswire, Palm, Inc.: Palm makes Internet personal and portable with MyPalm portal; New Wireless content and services to be imitated in public beta; Palm building mobile PIM-centric Portal, M2 Presswire, 14 November 2000 [PROQUEST] hereafter "M2"). With respect to claim 20, The Office Action

13

acknowledges that Tognazzinii and Henneuse fail to teach providing a notification to the user as to when to proceed in order to be on time base on ETA. (See Office Action, page 15, lines 10-12). However, the Office Action relies on M2 to resolve the deficiencies of Tognazzinii and Henneuse. Applicants respectfully submit that M2 does not disclose providing notification as to when to leave to be on time based on ETA or distance between the location of the attendee and the meeting place. M2 hints at providing a static reminder which reminds a user 10 minutes or 5 minutes before meeting start time, however this reminder is based on meeting start time not on how far the user must travel. (See M2 para. 1).

At least because claims 2-8, 10-15, 19, and 27-28 inherit the language of allowable independent claims, claims 2-8, 10-15, 19, and 27-28 are also allowable over Tognazzini in view of Henneuse or Tognazzini in view of Henneuse and PR1.

At least because claims 20-24, 26, and 29 inherit the language of allowable independent claims and M2 does not resolve the deficiencies of Tognazzini or Henneuse, claims 20-24 and 26 are also allowable over Tognazzini in view of Henneuse and M2.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100

```
┌─────────────────────┐
│      39262          │
│ PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE │
└─────────────────────┘
```

Date: June 13, 2006

Murrell W. Blackburn
Reg. No. 50,881

14